arXiv:1601.01204v4 [math.CO] 24 Aug 2016

MATROIDS OVER HYPERFIELDS

MATTHEW BAKER AND NATHAN BOWLER

Abstract. We present an algebraic framework which simultaneously generalizes the notion of linear subspaces, matroids, valuated matroids, and oriented matroids, as well as phased matroids in the sense of Anderson-Delucchi. We call the resulting objects *matroids over hyperfields*. In fact, there are (at least) two natural notions of matroid in this context, which we call *weak* and *strong* matroids. We give "cryptomorphic" axiom systems for such matroids in terms of circuits, Grassmann-Plücker functions, and dual pairs, and establish some basic duality theorems.

1. Introduction

Matroid theory is a remarkably rich part of combinatorics with links to algebraic geometry, optimization, and many other areas of mathematics. Matroids provide a useful abstraction of the notion of linear independence in vector spaces, and can be thought of as combinatorial analogues of linear subspaces of K^m, where K is a field. A key feature of matroids is that they possess a duality theory which abstracts the concept of orthogonal complementation from linear algebra. There are a number of important enhancements of the notion of matroid, including oriented matroids, valuated matroids, and phased matroids in the sense of Anderson-Delucchi. In this paper, we provide a simple algebraic framework for unifying all of these enhancements, introducing what we call **matroids over hyperfields**.

It turns out that there are (at least) two natural notions of matroids over a hyperfield F, which we call **weak F-matroids** and **strong F-matroids**.[1] In this paper we give "cryptomorphic" axiom systems for both kinds of F-matroids and present an example showing that the two notions of F-matroid diverge for certain hyperfields F.

1.1. **Hyperfields.** A (commutative) **hyperring** is an algebraic structure akin to a commutative ring but where addition is allowed to be multivalued. There is still a notion of additive inverse, but rather than requiring that x plus $-x$ equals 0, one merely assumes that 0 *belongs to the set* x plus $-x$. A hyperring in which every nonzero element has a multiplicative inverse is called a **hyperfield**.

Multivalued algebraic operations might seem exotic, but in fact hyperrings and hyperfields appear quite naturally in a number of mathematical settings and their properties have been explored by numerous authors in recent years.

The simplest hyperfield which is not a field is the so-called **Krasner hyperfield** $\mathbb{K}$, which as a multiplicative monoid consists of 0 and 1 with the usual multiplication rules. (This

Date: August 26, 2016.

The first author's research was supported by the National Science Foundation research grant DMS-1529573.

[1] In arXiv versions 1 through 3 of the present paper, the first author incorrectly claimed that weak and strong matroids coincide over all hyperfields. See §1.7 for a discussion of this error and how it has been rectified in the present version.

monoid is often denoted $\mathbb{F}_1$ in the algebraic geometry literature.) The addition law is almost the usual one as well, except that 1 plus 1 is defined to be the *set* $\{0,1\}$. Our definition of matroids over hyperfields will be such that a matroid over $\mathbb{K}$ turns out to be the same thing as a matroid in the usual sense.

A field K can trivially be considered as a hyperfield, and with our definitions a (strong or weak) matroid over K will be the same thing as a linear subspace of K^m for some positive integer m.

Some other hyperfields of particular interest are as follows (we write $x \boxplus y$ for the sum of x and y to emphasize that the sum is a set and not an element):

- (Hyperfield of signs) Let $\mathbb{S} := \{0, 1, -1\}$ with the usual multiplication law and hyperaddition defined by $1 \boxplus 1 = \{1\}$, $-1 \boxplus -1 = \{-1\}$, $x \boxplus 0 = 0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$, and $1 \boxplus -1 = -1 \boxplus 1 = \{0, 1, -1\}$. Then $\mathbb{S}$ is a hyperfield, called the **hyperfield of signs**.
- (Tropical hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{T}_+ := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, and for $a, b \in \mathbb{T}_+$ define their product by the rule $a \odot b := a + b$. Addition is defined by setting $a \boxplus b = \max(a, b)$ if $a \neq b$ and $a \boxplus b = \{c \in \mathbb{T}_+ \mid c \leq a\}$ if $a = b$. Thus 0 is a multiplicative identity element, $-\infty$ is an additive identity, and $\mathbb{T}_+$ is a hyperfield called the **tropical hyperfield**. O. Viro has illustrated the utility of the hyperfield $\mathbb{T}_+$ for the foundations of tropical geometry in several interesting papers (see e.g. [Vir10, Vir11]); we mention in particular that $-\infty$ belongs to the hypersum $a_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus a_n$ of $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{T}_+$ ($n \geq 2$) if and only if the maximum of the a_i occurs at least twice.
- (Phase hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{P} := S^1 \cup \{0\}$, where S^1 denotes the complex unit circle. Multiplication is defined as usual (so corresponds on S^1 to addition of phases). The hypersum $x \boxplus y$ of nonzero elements x, y is defined to be $\{0, x, -x\}$ if $y = -x$, and otherwise to consist of all points in the shorter of the two open arcs of S^1 connecting x and y. When one of x or y is zero, we set $x \boxplus 0 = 0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$. Then $\mathbb{P}$ is a hyperfield, called the **phase hyperfield**.
- (Triangle hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{V}$ be the set $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of nonnegative real numbers with the usual multiplication and the hyperaddition rule

$$a \boxplus b := \{c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ : \ |a - b| \leq c \leq a + b\}.$$

  (In other words, $a \boxplus b$ is the set of all real numbers c such that there exists a Euclidean triangle with side lengths a, b, c.)

With our general definition of matroids over hyperfields, we will find for example that:

- A (strong or weak) matroid over $\mathbb{S}$ is the same thing as an **oriented matroid** in the sense of Bland–Las Vergnas [BLV78].
- A (strong or weak) matroid over $\mathbb{T}$ is the same thing as a **valuated matroid** in the sense of Dress–Wenzel [DW92].
- There exists a weak matroid over $\mathbb{V}$ which is not a strong matroid.

Anderson and Delucchi consider aspects of both weak and strong matroids over $\mathbb{P}$ in [AD12], but there appears to be a mistake in their proof that the circuit, Grassmann–Plücker, and dual pair axioms for phased matroids are all equivalent (cf. the appendix to this paper). At present we do not know if weak $\mathbb{P}$-matroids are the same thing as strong $\mathbb{P}$-matroids (though we suspect not).

Both weak and strong matroids over hyperfields admit a duality theory which generalizes the existing duality theories in each of the above examples. All known proofs of the basic

duality theorems for oriented or valuated matroids are rather long and involved. One of our goals is to give a unified treatment of such duality results so that one only has to do the hard work once.

1.2. **Cryptomorphic axiomatizations.** Matroids famously admit a number of "cryptomorphic" descriptions, meaning that there are numerous axiom systems for them which turn out to be non-obviously equivalent. Two of the most useful cryptomorphic axiom systems for matroids (resp. oriented, valuated) are the descriptions in terms of *circuits* (resp. signed, valuated circuits) and *basis exchange axioms* (resp. chirotopes, valuated bases). A third (less well-known but also very useful) cryptomorphic description in all of these contexts involves *dual pairs*. We generalize all of these cryptomorphic descriptions (for both weak and strong matroids over hyperfields) with a single set of theorems and proofs.

The circuit description of strong (resp. weak) matroids over hyperfields is a bit technical to state, see §3 for the precise definition. Roughly speaking, though, if F is a hyperfield, a subset $\mathcal{C}$ of F^m not containing the zero-vector is the set of **F-circuits of a weak matroid with coefficients in** F if it is stable under scalar multiplication, satisfies a support-minimality condition, and obeys a *modular elimination law*. (The **support** of $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is the set of all i such that $X_i \neq 0$.) The "modular elimination" property means that if the supports of $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ are "sufficiently close" (in a precise poset-theoretic sense) and $X_i = -Y_i$ for some i, then one can find a "quasi-sum" $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ with $Z_i = 0$ and $Z_j \in X_j \boxplus Y_j$ for all j. The underlying idea is that the F-circuits of an F-matroid behave like the set of support-minimal nonzero vectors in a linear subspace of a vector space. The most subtle part of the definition is the restriction that the supports of X and Y be sufficiently close; this restriction is not encountered "classically" when working with matroids, oriented matroids, or valuated matroids, but it is necessary in the general context in which we work, as has already been demonstrated by Anderson and Delucchi in their work on phased matroids [AD12]. They give an example of a phased matroid which satisfies modular elimination but not a more robust elimination property. In §3 we also present a stronger and somewhat more technical set of conditions characterizing the set of F-circuits of a **strong** F-matroid.

In the general context of matroids over hyperfields, the simplest and most useful way to state the "basis exchange" or chirotope / phirotope axioms is in terms of what we call *Grassmann-Plücker functions*. A nonzero function $\varphi : F^r \to F$ is called a **Grassmann-Plücker function** if it is alternating and satisfies (hyperfield analogues of) the basic algebraic identities satisfied by the determinants of the $(r \times r)$-minors of an $r \times m$ matrix of rank r (see §3.4 for a precise definition). By a rather non-obvious construction, the definition of strong F-matroids in terms of strong F-circuits turns out to be cryptomorphically equivalent to the definition in terms of Grassmann-Plücker functions. We also define *weak Grassmann-Plücker functions* and relate them to weak F-circuits.

The "dual pair" description of F-matroids is perhaps the easiest one to describe in a non-technical way, assuming that one already knows what a matroid is. If $\underline{M}$ is a matroid in the usual sense, we call a subset $\mathcal{C}$ of F^m not containing 0 and closed under nonzero scalar multiplication an **F-signature** of $\underline{M}$ if the support of $\mathcal{C}$ in $E = \{1, \dots, m\}$ is the set of circuits of $\underline{M}$. The **inner product** of two vectors $X, Y \in F^m$ is $X \odot Y := \boxplus_{i=1}^m X_i \odot Y_i$, and we call X and Y **orthogonal** (written $X \perp Y$) if $0 \in X \odot Y$. A pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ consisting of an F-signature $\mathcal{C}$ of $\underline{M}$ and an F-signature $\mathcal{D}$ of the dual matroid $\underline{M}^*$ is called a **dual pair** if $X \perp Y$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$. By a rather complex chain of reasoning, it turns out that a strong F-matroid in either of the above two senses is equivalent to a dual pair

$(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ as above. We also define *weak dual pairs* and relate them to weak F-circuits and weak Grassmann-Plücker functions.

In the recent preprint [And16], Laura Anderson proves that strong F-matroids can be characterized in terms of a cryptomorphically equivalent set of *vector axioms*.

1.3. **Duality and functoriality.** If $\mathcal{C}$ is the collection of strong F-circuits of an F-matroid M and $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a dual pair of F-signatures of the matroid $\underline{M}$ underlying M (whose circuits are the supports of the F-circuits of M), it turns out that $\mathcal{D}$ is precisely the set of (non-empty) support-minimal elements of the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{C}$ in F^m, and $\mathcal{D}$ forms the set of F-circuits of a strong F-matroid M^* which we call the **dual strong F-matroid**. Duality behaves as one would hope: for example $M^{**} = M$, duality is compatible in the expected way with the notions of deletion and contraction, and the underlying matroid of the dual is the dual of the underlying matroid. There is a similar, and similarly behaved, notion of duality for weak F-matroids.

Matroids over hyperfields admit a useful push-forward operation: given a hyperfield homomorphism $f : F \to F'$ and a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid M, there is an induced strong (resp. weak) F'-matroid f_*M which can be defined using any of the cryptomorphically equivalent axiomatizations. The "underlying matroid" construction coincides with the push-forward of an F-matroid M to the Krasner hyperfield $\mathbb{K}$ (which is a final object in the category of hyperfields) via the canonical homomorphism $\psi : F \to \mathbb{K}$. If $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}$ is the map taking a real number to its sign and $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a linear subspace (considered in the natural way as an $\mathbb{R}$-matroid), the push-forward $\sigma_*(W)$ coincides with the oriented matroid which one traditionally associates to W. Similarly, if $v : K \to \mathbb{T}$ is the valuation on a non-Archimedean field and $W \subseteq K^m$ is a linear subspace, $v_*(W)$ is just the **tropicalization** of W considered as a *valuated matroid* (cf. [MS15]). There is a similar story for phased matroids and the natural "phase map" $p : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{P}$. If $\phi : K \to K'$ is an embedding of fields, the pushforward $\phi_*(M)$ of a K-matroid M corresponding to a linear subspace $W \subseteq K^m$ is the K'-matroid corresponding to the linear subspace $W \otimes_K K' \subseteq (K')^m$.

1.4. **Relation to the work of Dress and Wenzel.** In [Dre86], Andreas Dress introduced the notion of a **fuzzy ring** and defined matroids over such a structure, showing that linear subspaces, matroids in the usual sense, and oriented matroids are all examples of matroids over a fuzzy ring. In [DW92], Dress and Wenzel introduced the notion of *valuated matroids* as a special case of matroids over a fuzzy ring. The results of Dress and Wenzel in [Dre86, DW91, DW92] include a duality theorem and a cryptomorphic characterization of matroids over fuzzy rings in terms of Grassmann-Plücker functions. (They also work with possibly infinite ground sets, whereas for simplicity we restrict ourselves to the finite case.)

In their recent preprint [GJL16], Jeff Giansiracusa, Jaiung Jun, and Oliver Lorscheid show that there is a fully faithful functor from hyperfields to fuzzy rings which induces an equivalence between the theory of strong matroids over a hyperfield and the theory of matroids over the corresponding fuzzy ring. More precisely, their functor induces an equivalence of categories between hyperfields and *field-like* fuzzy rings which identifies strong matroids over the former with matroids over the latter.

Although matroids over fuzzy rings are somewhat more general than matroids over hyperfields, we believe our work has some advantages over the Dress–Wenzel theory, including the fact that (according to *MathSciNet*) few authors besides Dress and Wenzel themselves have

studied or used their notion of fuzzy ring, whereas there are dozens of papers in the literature concerned with hyperfields (including the recent interesting work of Connes–Consani [CC10, CC11] and Jun [Jun15a, Jun15b]). We plan to include a more detailed discussion of the connection between the present work and the Dress–Wenzel theory in a future version of this paper.

1.5. **Relation to the work of Anderson and Delucchi.** While the proofs of our main theorems are somewhat long and technical, in principle a great deal of the hard work has already been done in [AD12], so on a number of occasions we merely point out that a certain proof from [AD12] goes through *mutatis mutandis* in the general setting of matroids over hyperfields. (By way of contrast, the proofs in the standard works on oriented and valuated matroids tend to rely on special properties of the corresponding hyperfields which do not readily generalize.)

1.6. **Other related work.** Despite the formal similarity in their titles, the theory in this paper generalizes matroids in a rather different way from the paper "Matroids over a Ring" by Fink and Moci [FM15]. For example, if K is any field, a matroid over K in the sense of Fink–Moci is just a matroid in the usual sense (independent of K), while for us a matroid over K is a linear subspace of K^m. The work of Fink–Moci generalizes, among other things, the concept of *arithmetic matroids*, which we do not discuss.

The thesis of Bart Frenk [Fre13] deals with matroids over certain kinds of algebraic objects which he calls tropical semifields; these are defined as sub-semifields of $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. Matroids over tropical semifields include, as special cases, both matroids in the traditional sense and valuated matroids, but not for example oriented matroids, linear subspaces of K^m for a field K, or phased matroids. Tropical semifields are a particular special case of idempotent semifields, and matroids over the latter are the subject of an interesting recent paper by the Giansiracusa brothers [GG15]. They characterize matroids over idempotent semifields in a way which seems unlikely to generalize to the present setting of hyperfields. There is also a close connection between the tropical hyperfield $\mathbb{T}$ and the "supertropical semiring" of Izhakian–Rowen [IR10, IR11]; roughly speaking, the map sending a ghost element of the supertropical semiring to the set of all tangible elements less than or equal to it identifies the two structures.

1.7. **A note on the previous arXiv versions of this paper.** In arXiv versions 1 through 3 of the present paper (in which the first author was the sole author), there is a serious error which is related to the gap in [AD12] mentioned above. The second author noticed this mistake and found the counterexample discussed in §3.10 below. This made it clear that there are in fact at least two distinct notions of matroids over hyperfields (which we call "weak" and "strong", each of which admits a number of cryptomorphically equivalent axiomatizations. The present version of the paper is our attempt to correctly paint the landscape of matroids over hyperfields.

The problem with the previous versions of the present work occurs in the proof of Theorem 6.19 on page 29 of arXiv version 3. Shortly before the end of the proof, one finds the equation

$$X(e) \odot Y(e) = -X'(e) \odot Y(e) = \boxplus_{g \neq e} X'(g) \odot Y(g).$$

However, the term on the right is a set rather than a single element[2] so the second equality sign should be $\in$ rather than $=$. Unfortunately, this containment is not sufficient to give the desired result; indeed, the "desired result" is false as shown in §3.10 below.

In the present version, we have omitted the material on vector axioms and partial demifields from the first three arXiv versions in order to quickly post a fix to the problems just discussed. However, we plan to revise and generalize that material in either a sequel paper or an expansion of the present work.

1.8. **Structure of the paper.** We define hyperfields in Section 2 and discuss some key examples. In Section 3 we present different axiom systems for matroids over hyperfields, formulate a result saying that they are all cryptomorphically equivalent, and state the main results of duality theory. Proofs of the main theorems are deferred to Section 5. Section 4 contains the definition of hyperfield homomorphisms along with a discussion of the push-forward operations on F-matroids. There is a brief Appendix at the end of the paper collecting some errata from [AD12].

1.9. **Acknowledgments.** The first author would like to thank Felipe Rincon, Eric Katz, Oliver Lorscheid, and Ravi Vakil for useful conversations. He also thanks Laura Anderson, Dustin Cartwright, Alex Fink, and Felipe Rincon for pointing out some minor mistakes in the first arXiv version of this paper. Finally, he thanks Sam Payne and Rudi Pendavingh and two referees for helpful comments, and Louis Rowen for explaining the connection to his work with Izhakian and Knebusch.

2. Hyperstructures

2.1. **Basic definitions.** A hypergroup (resp. hyperring, hyperfield) is an algebraic structure similar to a group (resp. ring, field) except that addition is multivalued. More precisely, addition is a **hyperoperation** on a set S, i.e., a map $\boxplus$ from $S \times S$ to the collection of non-empty subsets of S. All hyperoperations in this paper will be *commutative*, though the non-commutative case is certainly interesting as well. (For more on hyperstructures, see for example [CC11] and [Jun15b, Appendix B].)

If A, B are non-empty subsets of S, we define

$$A \boxplus B := \bigcup_{a \in A, b \in B} (a \boxplus b)$$

and we say that $\boxplus$ is **associative** if $a \boxplus (b \boxplus c) = (a \boxplus b) \boxplus c$ for all $a, b, c \in S$.

Given an associative hyperoperation $\boxplus$, we define the hypersum $x_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus x_m$ of $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ for $m \geq 2$ recursively by the formula

$$x_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus x_m := \bigcup_{x' \in x_2 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus x_m} x_1 \boxplus x'.$$

Definition 2.1. A (commutative) **hypergroup** is a tuple $(G, \boxplus, 0)$, where $\boxplus$ is a commutative and associative hyperoperation on G such that:

- (H0) $0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$ for all $x \in G$.
- (H1) For every $x \in G$ there is a unique element of G (denoted $-x$ and called the **hyperinverse** of x) such that $0 \in x \boxplus -x$.

[2]When $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}| \leq 3$, the proof of Theorem 6.19 is okay because in that case the hypersum $\boxplus_{g \neq e} X'(g) \odot Y(g)$ is single-valued (as there is just one element other than e in $\underline{X}' \cap \underline{Y}$).

- (H2) $x \in y \boxplus z$ if and only if $z \in x \boxplus (-y)$.

Remark 2.2. Axiom (H2) is called *reversibility*, and in the literature a hypergroup is often only required to satisfy (H0) and (H1); a hypergroup satisfying (H2) is called a *canonical hypergroup*. Since we will deal only with hypergroups satisfying (H2), we will drop the (old-fashioned sounding) adjective 'canonical'.

The proof of the following is immediate:

Lemma 2.3. *If G is a hypergroup and $x, y, z \in G$, then $0 \in x \boxplus y \boxplus z$ if and only if $-z \in x \boxplus y$.*

Definition 2.4. A (commutative) **hyperring** is a tuple $(R, \odot, \boxplus, 1, 0)$ such that:

- $(R, \odot, 1)$ is a commutative monoid.
- $(R, \boxplus, 0)$ is a a commutative hypergroup.
- (Absorption rule) $0 \odot x = x \odot 0 = 0$ for all $x \in R$.
- (Distributive Law) $a \odot (x \boxplus y) = (a \odot x) \boxplus (a \odot y)$ for all $a, x, y \in R$.

As usual, we will denote a hyperring by its underlying set R when no confusion will arise. Note that any commutative ring R with 1 may be considered in a trivial way as a hyperring. We will sometimes write xy (resp. x/y) instead of $x \odot y$ (resp. $x \odot y^{-1}$) if there is no risk of confusion.

Remark 2.5. Our notion of hyperring is sometimes called a *Krasner hyperring* in the literature; it is a special case of a more general class of algebraic structures in which one allows multiplication to be multivalued as well. Since we will not make use of more general hyperrings in this paper, and since (following [CC11]) we will use the term 'Krasner hyperfield' for something different (see Example 2.10 below), we will not use the term 'Krasner hyperring'.

Remark 2.6. If we just require $(R, \boxplus, 0)$ in Definition 2.4 to satisfy (H0) and (H1), it follows automatically from the distributive law that it also satisfies (H2).

Remark 2.7. Let A be a multiplicative semigroup, let R be a commutative ring with 1, and let $\phi : R \twoheadrightarrow A$ be a surjective homomorphism of multiplicative semigroups such that $\phi^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$. The **induced hyperring structure** on A is defined by the hyperaddition law

$$x \boxplus y := \phi(\phi^{-1}(x) + \phi^{-1}(y)).$$

In particular, if R is a commutative ring with 1 and G is a subgroup of the group $R^\times$ of units in R, then the set R/G of orbits for the action of G on R by multiplication has a natural hyperring structure (cf. [CC11, Proposition 2.5]).

Definition 2.8. A hyperring F is called a **hyperfield** if $0 \neq 1$ and every non-zero element of F has a multiplicative inverse.

2.2. **Examples.** We now give some examples of hyperfields which will be important to us in the sequel.

Example 2.9. (Fields) If $F = K$ is a field, then F can be trivially considered as a hyperfield by setting $a \oplus b = a \cdot b$ and $a \boxplus b = \{a + b\}$.

Example 2.10. (Krasner hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{K} = \{0, 1\}$ with the usual multiplication rule, but with hyperaddition defined by $0 \boxplus x = x \boxplus 0 = \{x\}$ for $x = 0, 1$ and $1 \boxplus 1 = \{0, 1\}$. Then $\mathbb{K}$ is a hyperfield, called the **Krasner hyperfield** by Connes and Consani in [CC11]. This is

the hyperfield structure on $\{0,1\}$ induced (in the sense of Remark 2.7) by the field structure on F, for any field F, with respect to the trivial valuation $v : F \to \{0,1\}$ sending 0 to 0 and all non-zero elements to 1.

Example 2.11. (Tropical hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{T}_+ := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, and for $a, b \in \mathbb{T}_+$ define $a \cdot b = a + b$ (with $-\infty$ as an absorbing element). The hyperaddition law is defined by setting $a \boxplus b = \{\max(a,b)\}$ if $a \neq b$ and $a \boxplus b = \{c \in \mathbb{T}_+ \mid c \leq a\}$ if $a = b$. (Here we use the standard total order on $\mathbb{R}$ and set $-\infty \leq x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.) Then $\mathbb{T}_+$ is a hyperfield, called the **tropical hyperfield**. The additive hyperidentity is $-\infty$ and the multiplicative identity is 0. Because it can be confusing that $0, 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ are not the additive (resp. multiplicative) identity elements in $\mathbb{T}_+$, we will work instead with the isomorphic hyperfield $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ in which $0, 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ are the additive (resp. multiplicative) identity elements and multiplication is the usual multiplication. Hyperaddition is defined so that the map $\exp : \mathbb{T}_+ \to \mathbb{T}$ is an isomorphism of hyperfields.

Example 2.12. (Valuative hyperfields) More generally, if Γ is any totally ordered abelian group (written multiplicatively), there is a canonical hyperfield structure on $\Gamma \cup \{0\}$ defined in a similar way as for $\mathbb{T}$. The hyperfield structure on $\Gamma \cup \{0\}$ is induced from that on F by $\|\cdot\|$ for any surjective norm $\|\cdot\| : F \twoheadrightarrow \Gamma \cup \{0\}$ on a field F. We call a hyperfield which arises in this way a **valuative hyperfield**. In particular, both $\mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{T}$ are valuative hyperfields.

Example 2.13. (Hyperfield of signs) Let $\mathbb{S} := \{0, 1, -1\}$ with the usual multiplication law, and hyperaddition defined by $1 \boxplus 1 = \{1\}$, $-1 \boxplus -1 = \{-1\}$, $x \boxplus 0 = 0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$, and $1 \boxplus -1 = -1 \boxplus 1 = \{0, 1, -1\}$. Then $\mathbb{S}$ is a hyperfield, called the **hyperfield of signs**. The underlying multiplicative monoid of $\mathbb{S}$ is sometimes denoted by $\mathbb{F}_{1^2}$. The hyperfield structure on $\{0, 1, -1\}$ is induced from that on $\mathbb{R}$ by the map $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \{0, 1, -1\}$ taking 0 to 0 and a nonzero real number to its sign.

Example 2.14. (Phase hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{P} := S^1 \cup \{0\}$, where $S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$ is the complex unit circle. Multiplication is defined as usual, and the hyperaddition law is defined for $x, y \neq 0$ by setting $x \boxplus -x := \{0, x, -x\}$ and $x \boxplus y := \{\frac{\alpha x + \beta y}{\|\alpha x + \beta y\|} \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$ otherwise. The hyperfield structure on $S^1 \cup \{0\}$ is induced from that on $\mathbb{C}$ by the map $p : \mathbb{R} \to S^1 \cup \{0\}$ taking 0 to 0 and a nonzero complex number z to its phase $z/|z| \in S^1$.

Many other interesting examples of hyperstructures are given in Viro's papers [Vir10, Vir11] and the papers [CC10, CC11] of Connes and Consani. Here are a couple of examples taken from these papers:

Example 2.15. (Triangle hyperfield) Let $\mathbb{V}$ be the set $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of nonnegative real numbers with the usual multiplication and the hyperaddition rule

$$a \boxplus b := \{c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ : \ |a - b| \leq c \leq a + b\}.$$

(In other words, $a \boxplus b$ is the set of all real numbers c such that there exists a Euclidean triangle with side lengths a, b, c.) Then $\mathbb{V}$ is a hyperfield, closely related to the notion of *Litvinov-Maslov dequantization* (cf. [Vir10, §9]).

Example 2.16. (Adèle class hyperring) If K is a global field and A_K is its ring of adèles, the commutative monoid A_K/K^* (which plays an important role in Connes' conjectural approach to proving the Riemann hypothesis) is naturally endowed with the structure of a hyperring by Remark 2.7. It is, moreover, an algebra over the Krasner hyperfield $\mathbb{K}$ in a

natural way. One of the interesting discoveries of Connes and Consani [CC11] is that if K is the function field of a curve C over a finite field, the groupoid of prime elements of the hyperring A_K/K^* is canonically isomorphic to the loop groupoid of the maximal abelian cover of C.

Remark 2.17. There are examples of hyperfields which do not arise from the construction given in Remark 2.7; see [Mas85].

2.3. **Modules, linear independence, and orthogonality.**

Definition 2.18. Let R be a hyperring. An **R-module** is a commutative hypergroup M together with a map $R \times M \to M$, denoted $(r, m) \mapsto r \odot m$, such that

- $0 \odot x = 0$ for all $x \in M$ and $a \odot 0 = 0$ for all $a \in R$.
- $(a \odot b) \odot x = a \odot (b \odot x)$ for all $a, b \in R$ and $x \in M$.
- $a \odot (x \boxplus y) = (a \odot x) \boxplus (a \odot y)$ for all $a \in R$ and $x, y \in M$.
- $(a \boxplus b) \odot x = (a \odot x) \boxplus (b \odot x)$ for all $a, b \in R$ and $x \in M$, where for $A \subset R$ and $x \in M$ we define $A \odot x := \{a \odot x \mid a \in A\}$.

Example 2.19. If R is a hyperring and E is a set, the set R^E of functions from E to R with pointwise multiplication and hyperaddition is naturally an R-module. If $E = \{1, \dots, m\}$, we sometimes write R^m instead of R^E.

The **support** of $X \in R^E$, denoted $\underline{X}$ or $\operatorname{supp}(X)$, is the set of $e \in E$ such that $X(e) \neq 0$. If $A \subseteq R^E$, we set $\operatorname{supp}(A) := \{\underline{X} \mid X \in A\}$.

The **projective space** $\mathbb{P}(R^E)$ is defined to be the set of equivalence classes of elements of R^E under the equivalence relation where $X_1 \sim X_2$ if and only if $X_1 = \alpha \odot X_2$ for some $\alpha \in R^\times$. Note that the support of $X \in R^E$ depends only on its equivalence class in $\mathbb{P}(R^E)$. We let $\pi : R^E \backslash \{0\} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{P}(R^E)$ denote the natural projection.

We will define linear dependence in an R-module M by the condition that 0 lies in a certain hypersum, where the hypersum of $x_1, \dots, x_k \in M$, is defined in the evident way (see the remarks preceding Definition 2.1). To orient the reader, we provide some illustrative examples.

Example 2.20. If $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{K}$, then $0 \in x_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus x_k$ iff $\{i \mid x_i = 1\}$ does not have exactly one element.

Example 2.21. If $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{T}$, then $0 \in x_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus x_k$ if and only if the maximum of the x_i occurs (at least) twice, or $k = 1$ and $x_1 = 0$.

Example 2.22. If $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{S}$, then $0 \in x_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus x_k$ if and only if all $x_i = 0$ or the nonzero x_i's are not all equal.

Definition 2.23. (Linear independence) Let M be a module over the hyperring R. We say that elements $m_1, \dots, m_k$ are **linearly dependent** if there exist $c_1, \dots, c_k \in R$, not all 0, such that

$$0 \in (c_1 \odot m_1) \boxplus \cdots \boxplus (c_k \odot m_k).$$

Elements which are not linearly dependent are called **linearly independent**.

Example 2.24. If R is a commutative ring with 1, any module over R viewed as a ring is also a module over R viewed as a hyperring. In particular, if K is a field, then a K-module (with K considered as a hyperfield) is the same as a vector space V over K, and

$v_1, \ldots, v_k \in V$ are linearly (in)dependent in the sense of hyperfields if and only if they are linearly (in)dependent in the usual sense.

The following definitions will play an important role in the theory of duality which we develop later in this paper.

Definition 2.25. (Orthogonality) Let R be a hyperring, let $E = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, and let $M = R^E$, considered as an R-module. The **inner product** of $X = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $Y = (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is defined to be the set $X \odot Y := (x_1 \odot y_1) \boxplus \cdots \boxplus (x_m \odot y_m)$. We say that X, Y are **orthogonal**, denoted $X \perp Y$, if $0 \in X \odot Y$. If $S \subseteq M$, we denote by $S^\perp$ the set of all $X \in M$ such that $X \perp Y$ for all $Y \in S$.

Note for later reference that the condition $X \perp Y$ only depends on the equivalence classes of X, Y in $\mathbb{P}(R^E)$.

3. Matroids over hyperfields

Let E be a finite set. In this section, we will define what it means to be a strong (resp. weak) **matroid on E with coefficients in a hyperfield F**, or (for brevity) a strong (resp. weak) **matroid over F** or **F-matroid**. Our definition will be such that:

- When $F = K$ is a field, a strong or weak matroid on E with coefficients in K is the same thing as a vector subspace of K^E in the usual sense.
- A strong or weak matroid over $\mathbb{K}$ is the same thing as a **matroid**.
- A strong or weak matroid over $\mathbb{T}$ is the same thing as a **valuated matroid** in the sense of Dress–Wenzel [DW92].
- A strong or weak matroid over $\mathbb{S}$ is the same thing as an **oriented matroid** in the sense of Bland–Las Vergnas [BLV78].

See §3.9 for further details on the compatibility of our notion of F-matroid with various existing definitions in these particular examples.

3.1. Modular pairs.

As in the investigation of phased matroids by Anderson–Delucchi, a key ingredient for obtaining a robust notion of matroid in the general setting of hyperfields is the concept of *modular pairs*.

Definition 3.1. Let E be a set and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a collection of pairwise incomparable nonempty subsets of E. We say that $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ form a **modular pair** in $\mathcal{C}$ if $C_1 \neq C_2$ and $C_1 \cup C_2$ does not properly contain a union of two distinct elements of $\mathcal{C}$.

It is useful to reinterpret this definition in the language of *lattices*. We recall the relevant definitions for the reader's benefit.

Let $(S, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set (poset). A **chain** in S is a totally ordered subset J; the **length** of a chain is $\ell(J) := |J| - 1$. The **length** of S is the supremum of $\ell(J)$ over all chains J of S. The **height** of an element X of S is the largest n such that there is a chain $X_0 < X_1 < \ldots < X_n$ in S with $X_n = X$.

Given $x \in S$ we write $S_{\leq x} = \{y \in S \mid y \leq x\}$ and $S_{\geq x} = \{y \in S \mid y \geq x\}$. These are sub-posets of S. Let $x, y \in S$. If the poset $S_{\geq x} \cap S_{\geq y}$ has a unique minimal element, this element is denoted $x \vee y$ and called the **join** of x and y. If the poset $S_{\leq x} \cap S_{\leq y}$ has a unique maximal element, this element is denoted $x \wedge y$ and called the **meet** of x and y. The poset S is called a **lattice** if the meet and join are defined for any $x, y \in S$.

Every finite lattice L has a unique minimal element 0 and a unique maximal element 1. An element $x \in L$ is called an **atom** if there is no $z \in L$ with $0 < z < x$. Two atoms $x, y \in L$ form a **modular pair** if the height of $x \vee y$ is 2, i.e., $x \neq y$ and there do not exist $z, z' \in L$ with $0 < z < z' < x \vee y$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is any family of subsets of a set E, the set $U(\mathcal{S}) := \{\bigcup T \mid T \subseteq \mathcal{S}\}$ forms a lattice when equipped with the partial order coming from inclusion of sets, with join corresponding to union and with the meet of x and y defined to be the union of all sets in $\mathcal{S}$ contained in both x and y. If the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ are incomparable, then every $x \in \mathcal{S}$ is atomic as an element of $U(\mathcal{S})$. We say that two elements $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ are a **modular pair** if they are a modular pair in the lattice $U(\mathcal{S})$.

Our interest in modular pairs comes in part from the observation of Anderson and Delucchi that there is a nice axiomatization of *phased matroids* in terms of modular pairs of *phased circuits*, but general pairs of phased circuits do not obey circuit elimination. The following facts about modular pairs will come in quite handy:

Lemma 3.2 (cf. [Del11])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a collection of non-empty incomparable subsets of a finite set E. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *$\mathcal{C}$ is the set of circuits of a matroid M on E.*
(2) *Every pair C_1, C_2 of distinct elements of $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies* **circuit elimination***: if $e \in C_1 \cap C_2$ then there exists $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C_3 \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2)\backslash e$.*
(3) *Every modular pair in $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies circuit elimination.*

The following lemma, which can be pieced together from [Whi87, Lemma 2.7.1] and [MT01, Lemma 4.3] (and also makes a nice exercise), might help the reader get a better feeling for the concept of modular pairs in the context of matroid theory:

Lemma 3.3. *Let M be a matroid with rank function r, and let C_1, C_2 be distinct circuits of M. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *C_1, C_2 are a modular pair of circuits.*
(2) *$r(C_1 \cup C_2) + r(C_1 \cap C_2) = r(C_1) + r(C_2)$.*
(3) *$r(C_1 \cup C_2) = |C_1 \cup C_2| - 2$.*
(4) *For each $e \in C_1 \cap C_2$, there is a unique circuit C_3 with $C_3 \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2)\backslash e$, and this circuit has the property that C_3 contains the symmetric difference $C_1 \Delta C_2$.*
(5) *There are a basis B for M and a pair e_1, e_2 of distinct elements of $E\backslash B$ such that $C_1 = C(B, e_1)$ and $C_2 = C(B, e_2)$, where $C(B, e)$ denotes the fundamental circuit with respect to B and e.*

In particular, if M is the cycle matroid of a connected graph G then C_1, C_2 are a modular pair if and only if they are fundamental cycles associated to the same spanning tree T.

Note that for general circuits C_1 and C_2 in a matroid M, the **submodular inequality** asserts that $r(C_1 \cup C_2) + r(C_1 \cap C_2) \leq r(C_1) + r(C_2)$. Condition (2) of the lemma says that C_1 and C_2 form a modular pair if and only if *equality* holds in this inequality (hence the name "modular pair").

3.2. **Weak circuit axioms.** The following definition presents the first of several equivalent axiomatizations of weak matroids over hyperfields.

Definition 3.4. Let E be a non-empty finite set and let F be a hyperfield. A subset $\mathcal{C}$ of F^E is called the **F-circuit set of a weak F-matroid M on E** if $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies the following axioms:

- (C0) $0 \notin \mathcal{C}$.
- (C1) If $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha \in F^\times$, then $\alpha \odot X \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (C2) [Incomparability] If $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\underline{X} \subseteq \underline{Y}$, then there exists $\alpha \in F^\times$ such that $X = \alpha \odot Y$.
- (C3)$'$ [Modular Elimination] If $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ are a **modular pair of F-circuits** (meaning that $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ are a modular pair in $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{C})$) and $e \in E$ is such that $X(e) = -Y(e) \neq 0$, there exists an F-circuit $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $Z(e) = 0$ and $Z(f) \in X(f) \boxplus Y(f)$ for all $f \in E$.

This is equivalent to the axiom system for phased circuits given in [AD12] in the case of phased matroids (i.e., when $F = \mathbb{P}$). Also, the F-circuit Z in (C3)$'$ is *unique*. (Both of these observations follow easily from Lemma 3.3.)

If $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of F-circuits of a weak F-matroid M with ground set E, there is an underlying matroid (in the usual sense) $\underline{M}$ on E whose circuits are the supports of the F-circuits of M. (It is straightforward, in view of Lemma 3.2, to check that the circuit axioms for a matroid are indeed satisfied.)

Definition 3.5. The **rank** of M is defined to be the rank of the underlying matroid $\underline{M}$.

A **projective F-circuit** of M is an equivalence class of F-circuits of M under the equivalence relation $X_1 \sim X_2$ if and only if $X_1 = \alpha \odot X_2$ for some $\alpha \in F^\times$. Axioms (C0)-(C2) together imply that the map from projective F-circuits of M to circuits of $\underline{M}$ which sends a projective circuit C to its support is a *bijection*. In particular, M has only finitely many projective F-circuits, and one can think of a weak matroid over F as a matroid $\underline{M}$ together with a function associating to each circuit $\underline{C}$ of $\underline{M}$ an element $X(\underline{C}) \in \mathbb{P}(F^E)$ such that modular elimination holds for $\mathcal{C} := \pi^{-1}(\{X(\underline{C})\})$.

Remark 3.6. For a version of (C3)$'$ which holds even when X, Y are not assumed to be a modular pair, see Lemma 5.14. This weaker elimination property is not strong enough, however, to characterize weak F-matroids except in very special cases such as $F = \mathbb{K}$.

3.3. **Strong circuit axioms.** Let $L = U(\underline{\mathcal{C}})$ be the lattice of unions of supports of elements of $\mathcal{C}$. Suppose that we have a subset P of E, an indexed family $(X_p)_{p \in P}$ of F-circuits with $\underline{X}_p \cap P = \{p\}$, and an F-circuit X with $X(p) = -X_p(p)$ for all $p \in P$ but $\underline{X} \not\subseteq \bigcup_{p \in P} \underline{X}_p$. Then the height of $X \cup \bigcup_{p \in P} X_p$ in L is at least $|P| + 1$. We say that X and the X_p give a **modular elimination structure** if this height is exactly $|P| + 1$.

The following definition presents the first of several equivalent axiomatizations of strong matroids over hyperfields.

Definition 3.7. Let E be a non-empty finite set and let F be a hyperfield. A subset $\mathcal{C}$ of F^E is called the **F-circuit set of a strong F-matroid M on E** if $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies (C0),(C1),(C2), and the following stronger version of the modular elimination axiom (C3)$'$:

- (C3) [Strong modular elimination] For any modular elimination structure given by X and $(X_p)_{p \in P}$, there is an F-circuit Z such that $Z(p) = 0$ for all $p \in P$ and $Z(f) \in X(f) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p \in P} X_p(f))$ for any $f \in E$.

Any strong F-matroid on E is in particular a weak F-matroid on E (take $|P| = 1$ in the above definition), and we define the rank of such an F-matroid accordingly.

3.4. **Grassmann-Plücker functions.** We now describe a cryptomorphic characterization of weak and strong matroids over a hyperfield F in terms of **Grassmann-Plücker functions** (called "chirotopes" in the theory of oriented matroids and "phirotopes" in [AD12]). In addition to being interesting in its own right, this description will be crucial for establishing a duality theory for matroids over F.

Definition 3.8. Let E be a non-empty finite set, let F be a hyperfield, and let r be a positive integer. A **Grassmann-Plücker function of rank r on E with coefficients in F** is a function $\varphi : E^r \to F$ such that:

- (GP1) φ is not identically zero.
- (GP2) φ is alternating, i.e., $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_j, \ldots, x_r) = -\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_j, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_r)$ and $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_r) = 0$ if $x_i = x_j$ for some $i \neq j$.
- (GP3) [Grassmann–Plücker relations] For any two subsets $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r+1}\}$ and $\{y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}\}$ of E,

$$0 \in \boxplus_{k=1}^{r+1} (-1)^k \varphi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_k, \ldots, x_{r+1}) \odot \varphi(x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}). \tag{3.9}$$

For example, if $F = K$ is a field and A is an $r \times m$ matrix of rank r with columns indexed by E, it is a classical fact that the function φ_A taking an r-element subset of E to the determinant of the corresponding $r \times r$ minor of A is a Grassmann-Plücker function. The function φ_A depends (up to a non-zero scalar multiple) only on the row space of A, and conversely the row space of A is uniquely determined by the function φ_A (this is equivalent to the well-known fact that the *Plücker relations* cut out the Grassmannian $G(r, m)$ as a projective algebraic set).

We say that two Grassmann-Plücker functions φ_1 and φ_2 are **equivalent** if $\varphi_1 = \alpha \odot \varphi_2$ for some $\alpha \in F^\times$.

Theorem 3.10. *Let E be a non-empty finite set, let F be a hyperfield, and let r be a positive integer. There is a natural bijection between equivalence classes of Grassmann-Plücker functions of rank r on E with coefficients in F and strong F-matroids of rank r on E, defined via axioms* (C0) *through* (C3)*.*

The bijective map from equivalence classes of Grassmann-Plücker functions to strong F-matroids in Theorem 3.10 can be described explicitly as follows. Let B_φ be the **support** of φ, i.e., the collection of all subsets $\{x_1, \ldots, x_r\} \subset E$ such that $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_r) \neq 0$. Then B_φ is the set of bases for a rank r matroid M_φ (in the usual sense) on E (cf. [AD12, Remark 2.5]). For each circuit C of M_φ, we define a corresponding projective F-circuit $X \in \mathbb{P}(F^E)$ with $\mathrm{supp}(X) = C$ as follows. Let $x_0 \in C$ and let $\{x_1, \ldots, x_r\}$ be a basis for M_φ containing $C \backslash x_0$. Then

$$\frac{X(x_i)}{X(x_0)} = (-1)^i \frac{\varphi(x_0, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_r)}{\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_r)}. \tag{3.11}$$

We will show that this is well-defined, and give an explicit description of the inverse map from strong F-matroids to equivalence classes of Grassmann-Plücker functions.

Remark 3.12. When $F = \mathbb{K}$ is the Krasner hyperfield, it is not difficult to see that (3.9) is equivalent to the following well-known condition characterizing the set of bases of a matroid (cf. [Oxl92, Condition (B2), p.17]):

- (Basis Exchange Axiom) Given bases B, B' and $b \in B \backslash B'$, there exists $b' \in B' \backslash B$ such that $(B \cup \{b'\}) \backslash \{b\}$ is also a basis.

Definition 3.13. A **weak Grassmann-Plücker function of rank r on E with coefficients in** F is a function $\varphi : E^r \to F$ such that the support of φ is the set of bases of a rank r matroid on E and φ satisfies (GP1), (GP2), and the following variant of (GP3):

- (GP3)$'$ [3-term Grassmann–Plücker relations] Equation (3.9) holds for any two subsets $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r+1}\}$ and $\{y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}\}$ of E with $|I \backslash J| = 3$.

It is clear that any Grassmann-Plücker function is also a weak Grassmann-Plücker function.

Theorem 3.14. *Let E be a non-empty finite set, let F be a hyperfield, and let r be a positive integer. There is a natural bijection between equivalence classes of weak Grassmann-Plücker functions of rank r on E with coefficients in F and weak F-matroids of rank r on E, defined via axioms* (C0) *through* (C2) *and* (C3)$'$.

3.5. **Dressians.** For concreteness and ease of notation, write $E = \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ and let S denote the collection of r-element subsets of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$, so that $|S| = \binom{m}{r}$. Given a Grassmann-Plücker function φ, define the corresponding **Plücker vector** $p = (p_I)_{I \in S} \in F^S$ by $p_I := \varphi(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_r})$, where $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_r\}$ and $i_1 < \cdots < i_r$. Clearly φ can be recovered uniquely from p. The vector p satisfies an analogue of the Grassmann–Plücker relations (GP3); for example, the 3-term relations can be rewritten as follows: for every $A \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$ of size $r-2$ and $i, j, k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \backslash A$, we have

$$0 \in p_{A \cup i \cup j} \odot p_{A \cup k \cup \ell} \boxplus -p_{A \cup i \cup k} \odot p_{A \cup j \cup \ell} \boxplus p_{A \cup i \cup \ell} \odot p_{A \cup j \cup k}. \tag{3.15}$$

More generally, for all subsets I, J of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $|I| = r+1$, $|J| = r-1$, and $|I \backslash J| \geq 3$, the point $p = (p_I)$ lies on the "subvariety" of the projective space in the $\binom{m}{r}$ homogeneous variables x_I for $I \in S$ defined by

$$0 \in \boxplus_{i \in I} \mathrm{sign}(i; I, J) \odot x_{J \cup i} \odot x_{I \backslash i}, \tag{3.16}$$

where $\mathrm{sign}(i; I, J) = (-1)^s$ with s equal to the number of elements $i' \in I$ with $i < i'$ plus the number of elements $j \in J$ with $i < j$.

Although we will not explore this further in the present paper, one can view the "equations" (3.16) as defining a hyperring scheme $D(r, m)$ in the sense of [Jun15a], which (following [MS15, §4.4]) we call the F**-Dressian**. In this geometric language, Theorem 3.10 says that a strong matroid of rank r on $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ over a hyperfield F can be identified with an F-valued point of $D(r, m)$; thus $D(r, m)$ is a "moduli space" for rank r matroids over F. If $F = K$ is a field, the K-Dressian $D(r, m)$ coincides with the Grassmannian variety $G(r, m)$ over K.

3.6. **Duality.** There is a duality theory for matroids over hyperfields which generalizes the established duality theory for matroids, oriented matroids, valuated matroids, etc. (For matroids over fields, it corresponds to orthogonal complementation.)

Theorem 3.17. *Let E be a non-empty finite set with $|E| = m$, let F be a hyperfield, and let M be a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid of rank r on E with strong (resp. weak) F-circuit set $\mathcal{C}$ and Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function) φ. There is a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid M^* of rank $m-r$ on E, called the* **dual F-matroid** *of M, with the following properties:*

- *The set $\mathcal{C}^*$ of F-circuits of M^* are the elements of* $\mathrm{SuppMin}(\mathcal{C}^\perp - \{0\})$*, where* $\mathrm{SuppMin}(S)$ *denotes the elements of S of minimal support.*
- *A Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function) φ^* for M^* is defined by the formula*
$$\varphi^*(x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}) = \mathrm{sign}(x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}, x'_1, \dots, x'_r)\varphi(x'_1, \dots, x'_r),$$
where $x'_1, \dots, x'_r$ is any ordering of $E \backslash \{x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}\}$.
- *The underlying matroid of M^* is the dual of the underlying matroid of M, i.e., $\underline{M^*} = \underline{M}^*$.*
- *$M^{**} = M$.*

The F-circuits of M^* are called the **F-cocircuits** of M, and vice-versa.

3.7. **Dual pairs.** Let M be a (classical) matroid with ground set E. We call a subset $\mathcal{C}$ of F^E an **F-signature of** M if $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies properties (C0) and (C1) from Definition 3.4, and taking supports gives a bijection from the projectivization of $\mathcal{C}$ to circuits of M.

Definition 3.18. We say that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a **dual pair of F-signatures of** M if:

- (DP1) $\mathcal{C}$ is an F-signature of the matroid M.
- (DP2) $\mathcal{D}$ is an F-signature of the dual matroid M^*.
- (DP3) $\mathcal{C} \perp \mathcal{D}$, meaning that $X \perp Y$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$.

Theorem 3.19. *Let M be a matroid on E, let $\mathcal{C}$ be an F-signature of M, and let $\mathcal{D}$ be an F-signature of M^*. Then $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are the set of F-circuits and F-cocircuits, respectively, of a strong F-matroid with underlying matroid M if and only if $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ satisfies* (DP3) *(i.e., is a dual pair of F-signatures of M).*

Definition 3.20. We say that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a **weak dual pair of F-signatures of** M if $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ satisfy (DP1),(DP2), and the following weakening of (DP3):

- (DP3)$'$ $\mathcal{C} \perp \mathcal{D}$ for every pair $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ with $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}| \leq 3$.

Theorem 3.21. *Let M be a matroid on E, let $\mathcal{C}$ be an F-signature of M, and let $\mathcal{D}$ be an F-signature of M^*. Then $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are the set of F-circuits and F-cocircuits, respectively, of a weak F-matroid with underlying matroid M if and only if $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ satisfies* (DP3)$'$ *(i.e., is a weak dual pair of F-signatures of M).*

Remark 3.22. Suppose that we are given an involution $\tau\colon x \mapsto \overline{x}$ of our hyperfield F. Then we could get an equivalent duality theory in which we apply the involution to all elements of the hyperfield assigned to the dual matroid. Thus the dual of a Grassmann-Plücker function would be given by the formula
$$\varphi^*(x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}) = \mathrm{sign}(x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}, x'_1, \dots, x'_r)\overline{\varphi(x'_1, \dots, x'_r)},$$
and the inner product giving the orthogonality between circuits and cocircuits would be $X \odot Y := (x_1 \odot \overline{y}_1) \boxplus \cdots \boxplus (x_m \odot \overline{y}_m)$. The advantage of this approach is that this scalar product is more natural in certain cases, such as when F is the field of complex numbers

or the phase hyperfield and the involution is given by conjugation. This is the approach taken by Anderson and Delucchi in [AD12]. Since, however, the theory with the involution is completely equivalent to that without, for the sake of notational simplicity we shall not make use of such an involution in this paper.

3.8. **Minors.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of F-circuits of a (strong or weak) F-matroid M on E, and let $A \subseteq E$. For $X \in \mathcal{C}$, define $X\backslash A \in F^{E\backslash A}$ by $(X\backslash A)(e) = X(e)$ for $e \notin A$. (Thus $X\backslash A$ can be thought of as the restriction of X to the complement of A.)

Let $\mathcal{C}\backslash A = \{X\backslash A \mid X \in \mathcal{C},\ \underline{X} \cap A = \emptyset\}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{C}/A = \mathrm{SuppMin}(\{X[A] \mid X \in \mathcal{C}\})$.

Theorem 3.23. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of F-circuits of a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid M on E, and let $A \subseteq E$. Then $\mathcal{C}\backslash A$ is the set of F-circuits of a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid $M\backslash A$ on $E\backslash A$, called the* **deletion** *of M with respect to A, whose underlying matroid is $\underline{M}\backslash A$. Similarly, $\mathcal{C}/A$ is the set of F-circuits of a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid M/A on $E\backslash A$, called the* **contraction** *of M with respect to A, whose underlying matroid is $\underline{M}/A$. Moreover, we have $(M\backslash A)^* = M^*/A$ and $(M/A)^* = M^*\backslash A$.*

3.9. **Equivalence of different definitions.** We briefly indicate how to see the equivalence of various flavors of matroids in the literature with our notions of strong and weak F-matroid, for some specific choices of the hyperfield F.

Example 3.24. When $F = K$ is a field, a strong or weak matroid on E with coefficients in K is the same thing as a vector subspace of K^E in the usual sense. Indeed, a weak Grassmann-Plücker function with coefficients in a field K automatically satisfies (GP3) (cf. the proof of [KL72, Theorem 1]), and the bijection between r-dimensional subspaces of K^E and equivalence classes of rank r Grassmann-Plücker functions with coefficients in K also follows from *loc. cit.*

Example 3.25. A strong or weak matroid over $\mathbb{K}$ is the same thing as a matroid in the usual sense.

Example 3.26. A strong or weak matroid over $\mathbb{T}$ is the same thing as a valuated matroid in the sense of Dress–Wenzel [DW92]. This follows from [MT01, Theorem 3.2] and the discussion at the top of page 202 in *loc. cit.*

Example 3.27. A strong or weak matroid over $\mathbb{S}$ is the same thing as an **oriented matroid** in the sense of Bland–Las Vergnas [BLV78]. This follows for example from [BLVS$^+$99, Theorems 3.5.5 and 3.6.2].

3.10. **A weak F-matroid which is not a strong F-matroid.**

Example 3.28. Let F be the triangle hyperfield $\mathbb{V}$ (cf. Example 2.15). Consider the Grassmann-Plücker function φ of rank 3 on the 6 element set $E = \{1, 2, \ldots 6\}$ with coeffiecients in F given by

$$\varphi(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \{1, 5, 6\} \\ 2 & \text{if } \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} \text{ consists of one element from each of} \\ & \{1\},\ \{2, 3, 4\} \text{ and } \{5, 6\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise, as long as the } x_i \text{ are distinct} \\ 0 & \text{if the } x_i \text{ are not distinct.} \end{cases}$$

Then φ is symmetric under permutation of the second, third and fourth coordinates, as well as under exchange of the fifth and sixth coordinates. It is clear that φ satisfies (GP1) and (GP2), and the support of φ is the set of bases of the uniform matroid $U_{3,6}$ of rank 3 on 6 elements. We will now verify that φ also satisfies (GP3)$'$.

Suppose we have subsets $I = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $J = \{y_1, y_2\}$ of E with $|I \setminus J| = 3$. Then $|I \cap J| = 1$. So all summands in the corresponding 3-term Grassmann-Plücker relation are in the set $\{0, 1, 2, 4\}$. In order to show that the relation holds, it suffices to show that there cannot be summands equal to each of 1 and 4. So suppose for a contradiction that $\varphi(x_2, x_3, x_4) \odot \varphi(x_1, y_1, y_2) = 1$ but $\varphi(x_1, x_3, x_4) \odot \varphi(x_2, y_1, y_2) = 4$. Then we have $\varphi(x_2, x_3, x_4) = \varphi(x_1, y_1, y_2) = 1$. Since $\varphi(x_1, y_1, y_2)$ and $\varphi(x_2, y_1, y_2)$ are nonzero, neither x_1 nor x_2 is in J. If $\varphi(x_1, x_3, x_4) = 4$ then $x_1 = 1$ and $\{x_3, x_4\} = \{5, 6\}$, but neither 5 nor 6 can be in J since $\varphi(x_1, y_1, y_2) = 1$. So I and J are disjoint, which is impossible. If $\varphi(x_1, y_1, y_2) = 4$ then a similar argument again shows that I and J are disjoint, which is impossible. The only remaining case is that $\varphi(x_1, x_3, x_4) = \varphi(x_2, y_1, y_2) = 2$. Thus both of these sets contain 1, so that without loss of generality $y_1 = 1$. Then $y_2 \notin \{5, 6\}$, so $x_2 \in \{5, 6\}$. Thus neither of x_3 or x_4 can be 1, so $x_1 = 1$, so that $\varphi(x_1, y_1, y_2) = 0$, again a contradiction.

On the other hand, not all of the Grassmann-Plücker relations are satisfied. Let $I = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $J = \{5, 6\}$. The corresponding Grassmann-Plücker relation is $0 \in (1 \odot 4) \boxplus (1 \odot 1) \boxplus (1 \odot 1) \boxplus (1 \odot 1)$, which is false.

4. Realizability

In this section we discuss the concept of *realizability* in the general context of push-forward maps.

4.1. **Homomorphisms.**

Definition 4.1. A **hypergroup homomorphism** is a map $f : G \to H$ such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f(x \boxplus y) \subseteq f(x) \boxplus f(y)$ for all $x, y \in G$.

A **hyperring homomorphism** is a map $f : R \to S$ which is a homomorphism of additive hypergroups as well as a homomorphism of multiplicative monoids (i.e., $f(1) = 1$ and $f(x \odot y) = f(x) \odot f(y)$ for $x, y \in R$).

A **hyperfield homomorphism** is a homomorphism of the underlying hyperrings.

We define the **kernel** $\ker(f)$ of a hyperring homomorphism f to be $f^{-1}(0)$. Note that a hyperring homomorphism must send units to units, and therefore if $f : R \to S$ is a homomorphism and R is a hyperfield, we must have $\ker(f) = \{0\}$.

Example 4.2. A hyperring homomorphism from a commutative ring R with 1 to the Krasner hyperfield $\mathbb{K}$ (cf. Example 2.10) is the same thing as a prime ideal of R, via the correspondence $\mathfrak{p} := \ker(f)$.

Example 4.3. A hyperring homomorphism from a commutative ring R with 1 to the tropical hyperfield $\mathbb{T}$ is the same thing as a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R together with a real valuation on the residue field of $\mathfrak{p}$ (i.e., the fraction field of $R/\mathfrak{p}$). (Similarly, a hyperring homomorphism from R to $\Gamma \cup \{0\}$ for some totally ordered abelian group Γ is the same thing as a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R together with a Krull valuation on the residue field of $\mathfrak{p}$.) In particular, a hyperring homomorphism from a field K to $\mathbb{T}$ is the same thing as a real valuation on K. These

observations allow one to reformulate the basic definitions in Berkovich's theory of analytic spaces [Ber90] in terms of hyperrings, though we will not explore this further in the present paper.

Example 4.4. A hyperring homomorphism from a commutative R with 1 to the hyperfield of signs $\mathbb{S}$ is the same thing as prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ together with an ordering on the residue field of $\mathfrak{p}$ (see e.g. [Mar06, §3]). In particular, a hyperring homomorphism from a field K to $\mathbb{S}$ is the same thing as an ordering on K. This observation allows one to reformulate the notion of *real spectrum* [BPR06, Mar96] in terms of hyperrings, and provides an interesting lens through which to view the analogy between Berkovich spaces and real spectra.

4.2. **Push-forwards and realizability.** Recall that if F is a hyperfield and M is an F-matroid on E, there is an underlying classical matroid $\underline{M}$, and that classical matroids are the same as matroids over the Krasner hyperfield $\mathbb{K}$. We now show that the "underlying matroid" construction is a special case of a general push-forward operation on matroids over hyperfields.

The following lemma is straightforward from the various definitions involved:

Lemma 4.5. *If $f : F \to F'$ is a homomorphism of hyperfields and M is a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid on E,*

$$\{c' f_*(X) \ : \ c' \in F', \ X \in \mathcal{C}(M)\}$$

is the set of F'-circuits of a strong (resp. weak) F'-matroid $f_*(M)$ on E, called the **push-forward** *of M.*

Remark 4.6. If F is a hyperfield, there is a canonical homomorphism $\psi : F \to \mathbb{K}$ sending 0 to 0 and all non-zero elements of F to 1. If M is an F-matroid, the push-forward $\psi_*(M)$ coincides with the underlying matroid $\underline{M}$.

Given a Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function) $\varphi : E^r \to F$ and a homomorphism of hyperfields $f : F \to F'$, we define the **push-forward** $f_*\varphi : E^r \to F'$ by the formula

$$(f_*\varphi)(e_1, \ldots, e_r) = f(\varphi(e_1, \ldots, e_r)).$$

This is easily checked to once again be a Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function).

As an immediate consequence of (3.11), we see that the push-forward of an F-matroid can be defined using either circuits or Grassmann-Plücker functions:

Lemma 4.7. *If M_φ is the strong (resp. weak) F-matroid associated to the Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function) $\varphi : E^r \to F$, and $f : F \to F'$ is a homomorphism of hyperfields, then $f_*(M_\varphi) = M_{f_*\varphi}$.*

It is also straightforward to check (using either circuits or Grassmann-Plücker functions) that if M is a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid and $f : F \to F'$ is a homomorphism of hyperfields, then the dual strong (resp. weak) F'-matroid to $f_*(M)$ is $f_*(M^*)$. Summarizing our observations in this section, we have:

Corollary 4.8. *If M is a strong (resp. weak) F-matroid with F-circuit set $\mathcal{C}(M)$ and Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function) φ, and $f : F \to F'$ is a homomorphism of hyperfields, the following coincide:*

(1) *The strong (resp. weak) F'-matroid whose F'-circuits are* $\{c'f_*(X) \,:\, c' \in F',\ X \in \mathcal{C}(M)\}$.
(2) *The strong (resp. weak) F'-matroid whose F'-cocircuits are* $\{c'f_*(Y) \,:\, c' \in F',\ Y \in \mathcal{C}(M^*)\}$.
(3) *The strong (resp. weak) F'-matroid whose Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. weak Grassmann-Plücker function) is $f_*\varphi$.*

Definition 4.9. Let $f : F \to F'$ be a homomorphism of hyperfields, and let M' be a strong (resp. weak) matroid on E with coefficients in F'. We say that M' is **realizable with respect to** f if there is a strong (resp. weak) matroid M over F such that $f_*(M) = M'$.

If $F' = \mathbb{K}$ is the Krasner hyperfield, so that M' is a matroid in the usual sense, we say that M' is **strongly realizable over** F (resp. **weakly realizable over** F) if there is a strong (resp. weak) matroid M over F such that $\psi_*(M) = M'$, where $\psi : F \to \mathbb{K}$ is the canonical homomorphism.

5. Proofs

In this section, we provide proofs of the main theorems of the paper. We closely follow the arguments of Anderson–Delucchi from [AD12]; when the proof is a straightforward modification of a corresponding result in *loc. cit.*, we sometimes omit details.

5.1. **Weak Grassmann-Plücker functions and Duality.** Given a weak Grassmann-Plücker function φ of rank r on the ground set E, we set

$$\mathbf{B}_\varphi := \{\{b_1, \dots, b_r\} \mid \varphi(b_1, \dots, b_r) \neq 0\}.$$

Recall that this is the set of bases of a matroid of rank r, which we denote by $\underline{M}_\varphi$ and call the **underlying matroid** of φ.

In what follows, we fix a total order on E.

Definition 5.1. Let φ be a rank r weak Grassmann-Plücker function on E, and for every ordered tuple $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-r}) \in E^{m-r}$ let $x'_1, \dots, x'_r$ be an ordering of $E\backslash\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-r}\}$. Define the **dual weak Grassmann-Plücker function** φ^* by

$$\varphi^*(x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}) := \operatorname{sign}(x_1, \dots, x_{m-r}, x'_1, \dots, x'_r)\varphi(x'_1, \dots, x'_r).$$

Note that, up to a global change in sign, φ^* is independent of the choice of ordering of $E\backslash\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-r}\}$.

Lemma 5.2. *φ^* is a rank $(m-r)$ weak Grassmann-Plücker function, and the underlying matroid $\underline{M}_{\varphi^*}$ is the matroid dual of $\underline{M}_\varphi$. If φ is Grassmann-Plücker function then so is φ^*.*

Proof. The fact that $\mathbf{B}_{\varphi^*}$ is the set of bases for $\underline{M}^*_\varphi$ follows from [AD12, Theorem A.5] as in the proof of [AD12, Lemma 3.2]. To see that φ^* is a rank $(m-r)$ weak Grassmann-Plücker function (resp. Grassmann-Plücker function), it suffices to prove (GP3)′ (resp. (GP3)) since (GP1) and (GP2) are clear. This also follows from [AD12, Proof of Lemma 3.2]. □

5.2. **Weak Grassmann-Plücker functions and Minors.** Let φ be a rank r weak Grassmann-Plücker function on E, and let $A \subset E$.

Definition 5.3. (1) (Contraction) Let ℓ be the rank of A in $\underline{M}_\varphi$, and let $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_\ell\}$ be a maximal φ-independent subset of A. Define $\varphi/A : (E\backslash A)^{r-\ell} \to F$ by

$$(\varphi/A)(x_1, \dots, x_{r-\ell}) := \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{r-\ell}, a_1, \dots, a_\ell).$$

(2) (Deletion) Let k be the rank of $E\backslash A$ in $\underline{M_\varphi}$, and choose $a_1, \ldots, a_{r-k} \subseteq A$ such that $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{r-k}\}$ is a basis of $\underline{M_\varphi}/(E \setminus A)$. Define $\varphi\backslash A : (E\backslash A)^k \to F$ by

$$(\varphi\backslash A)(x_1, \ldots, x_k) := \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_k, a_1, \ldots, a_{r-k}).$$

The proof of the following lemma is the same as the proofs of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 of [AD12]:

Lemma 5.4. (1) *Both φ/A and $\varphi\backslash A$ are weak Grassmann-Plücker functions, and they are Grassmann-Plücker functions if φ is. Their definitions are independent of all choices up to global multiplication by a nonzero element of F.*
(2) *$\underline{M_{\varphi/A}} = \underline{M_\varphi}/A$ and $\underline{M_{\varphi\backslash A}} = \underline{M_\varphi}\backslash A$.*
(3) *$(\varphi\backslash A)^* = \varphi^*/A$.*

5.3. **Dual Pairs from Grassmann-Plücker functions.** Let φ be a rank r weak Grassmann-Plücker function on E with underlying matroid $\underline{M_\varphi}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let C be a circuit of M_φ, and let $e, f \in C$. The quantity*

$$\frac{\varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_r)}{\varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_r)} := \varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_r)^{-1}$$

is independent of the choice of $x_2, \ldots, x_r$ such that $\{f, x_2, \ldots, x_r\}$ is a basis for M_φ containing $C\backslash e$.

Proof. (cf. [AD12, Lemma 4.1]) Let $\{f, x_2, \ldots, x_{r-1}, x_r'\}$ be another basis for M_φ containing $C\backslash e$. By Axiom (GP3)′, we have

$$0 \in \varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_{r-1}, x_r') \boxplus -\varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_{r-1}, x_r')$$

which implies, by Axiom (H1) in Definition 2.1, that

$$\varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_{r-1}, x_r') = \varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_{r-1}, x_r').$$

This proves the lemma for φ-bases which differ by a single element, and the general case follows by induction on the number of elements by which two chosen bases differ. □

Definition 5.6. Define $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ to be the collection of all $X \in F^E$ such that:
(1) $\underline{X}$ is a circuit of M_φ
(2) For every $e, f \in E$ and every basis $B = \{f, x_2, \ldots, x_r\}$ with $\mathrm{supp}(X)\backslash e \subseteq B$, we have

$$\frac{X(f)}{X(e)} = -\frac{\varphi(e, x_2, \ldots, x_r)}{\varphi(f, x_2, \ldots, x_r)}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ depends only on the equivalence class of φ. Set $\mathcal{D}_\varphi := \mathcal{C}_{\varphi^*}$.

Lemma 5.7. (1) *The sets $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ form a weak dual pair of F-signatures of M_φ in the sense of §3.7.*
(2) *If φ is a Grassmann-Plücker function then $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ form a dual pair.*
(3) *$\mathcal{C}_{\varphi/e} = \mathcal{C}_\varphi/e$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\varphi\backslash e} = \mathcal{C}_\varphi\backslash e$.*

Proof. (cf. [AD12, Proposition 4.3]) The only nontrivial thing to check is (DP3)′ (resp. (DP3)). To see this, let $X \in \mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}_\varphi$, assuming furthermore that $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}| \leq 3$ if φ is not a Grassmann-Plücker function. If $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y} = \emptyset$ then $X \perp Y$ by definition. Otherwise, we can write $\underline{X} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ and $\underline{Y} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_\ell\}$ with the elements of $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} = \{y_1, \ldots y_n\}$ written first, so that $n \geq 1$ and $x_i = y_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Since $\underline{X}\backslash x_i$ is independent for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we must have $k \leq r+1$, and similarly $\ell \leq m-r+1$. As $\underline{M}_\varphi$ is a matroid, there are extensions $\underline{X}' = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{r+1}\}$ of $\underline{X}$ and $\underline{Y}' = \{y_1, \ldots, y_{m-r+1}\}$ of $\underline{Y}$, respectively, such that $\underline{X}'\backslash x_i$ (resp. $\underline{Y}'\backslash y_j$) is a basis of $\underline{M}_\varphi$ (resp. $\underline{M}_{\varphi^*}$) for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ (resp. $1 \leq j \leq \ell$). Furthermore, we can choose these extensions so that $\underline{X}' \cap \underline{Y}' = \underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}$. Write $E\backslash\{y_1, \ldots, y_{m-r+1}\} = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1}\}$. If $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}| \leq 3$ then $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r+1}\} \setminus \{z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1}\}| \leq 3$. By either (GP3) or (GP3)′, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \boxplus_{i=1}^{r+1}(-1)^i \odot \varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_{r+1}) \odot \varphi(x_i, z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1}) \\ &= \boxplus_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^i \odot \varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_{r+1}) \odot \varphi(x_i, z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1}) \\ &= \boxplus_{i=1}^{n}\sigma \odot \varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_{r+1}) \odot \varphi^*(y_1, \ldots, \hat{y}_i, \ldots, y_{m-r+1}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where

$$\sigma = (-1)^{r-1}\text{sign}(z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{m-r+1}).$$

Multiplying both sides of (5.8) by

$$\sigma \odot \varphi(x_2, \ldots, x_{r+1})^{-1} \odot \varphi^*(y_2, \ldots, y_{m-r+1})^{-1}$$

gives

$$0 \in \boxplus_{i=1}^{n} X(x_i) \odot X(x_1)^{-1} \odot Y(x_i) \odot Y(y_1)^{-1}. \tag{5.9}$$

Multiplying both sides of (5.9) by $X(x_1) \odot Y(y_1)$ then shows that $X \perp Y$. □

Corollary 5.10. *With notation as in Lemma 5.7, we have:*

(1) *For $X \in \mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $x_i, x_j \in \underline{X}$,*

$$\frac{X(x_i)}{X(x_j)} = (-1)^{i-j}\frac{\varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_{r+1})}{\varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_j, \ldots, x_{r+1})}.$$

(2) *For $Y \in \mathcal{D}_\varphi$ and $y_i, y_j \in \underline{Y}$,*

$$Y(y_j) \odot Y(y_i)^{-1} = \frac{\varphi(y_j, z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1})}{\varphi(y_i, z_1, \ldots, z_{r-1})}.$$

Proof. This follows from the same argument as [AD12, Corollary 4.4]. □

5.4. **Grassmann-Plücker functions from Dual Pairs.** In the previous section, we associated a (weak) dual pair $(\mathcal{C}_\varphi, \mathcal{D}_\varphi)$, depending only on the equivalence class of φ, to each (weak) Grassmann-Plücker function φ. However, we don't yet know that $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ satisfy the modular elimination axiom (although this will turn out later to be the case). In this section, we go the other direction, associating a (weak) Grassmann-Plücker function to a (weak) dual pair.

Theorem 5.11. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be a weak dual pair of F-signatures of a matroid $\underline{M}$ of rank r. Then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\varphi$ for a rank r weak Grassmann-Plücker function φ which is uniquely determined up to equivalence. If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ form a dual pair then φ is a Grassmann-Plücker function.*

Proof. The proof of this result, while rather long and technical, is essentially the same as the special case of phased matroids given in [AD12, Proposition 4.6]. Rather than reproduce the entire argument, which takes up 4.5 pages of [AD12], we will content ourselves with indicating the (minor) changes which need to be made in the present context.

Step 1 from *loc. cit.* goes through without modification. In Step 2, the orthogonality relation $\mathcal{C} \perp \mathcal{D}$ now imples that $Y(f) \odot Y(e)^{-1} = -X(e) \odot X(f)^{-1}$ rather than $Y(e)Y(f)^{-1} = -X(e)X(f)^{-1}$. Thus the displayed equation (4) needs to be replaced with

$$Y(e) \odot Y(f)^{-1} = \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(e, t_2, \ldots, t_r) \odot \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(f, t_2, \ldots, t_r)$$

(instead of the reciprocal of the right-hand side).

In Step 3, equations (3) and (4) and the assumption $X \perp Y$ show (with notation from *loc. cit.*) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \boxplus_{x_i \in C_S \cap D_T} X(x_i) \odot Y(x_i) \\ &= \boxplus_{x_i \in C_S \cap D_T} \frac{X(x_i)}{X(x_0)} \odot \frac{Y(x_i)}{Y(x_0)} \\ &= \boxplus_{x_i \in C_S \cap D_T} (-1)^i \frac{\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_r)}{\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_1, \ldots, x_r)} \odot \frac{\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_i, y_2, \ldots, y_r)}{\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0, y_2, \ldots, y_r)} \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

and multiplying both sides of (5.12) by $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_1, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0, y_2, \ldots, y_r)$ gives

$$0 \in \boxplus_{x_i \in C_S \cap D_T} (-1)^i \odot \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_r) \odot \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}(x_i, y_2, \ldots, y_r),$$

which is (GP3). □

5.5. **From Grassmann-Plücker functions to Circuits.** In this section, we prove that the set $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ of elements of F^E induced by a (weak) Grassmann-Plücker function φ is the set of F-circuits of a (weak) F-matroid with support $\underline{M}_\varphi$. The only non-trivial axiom is the Modular Elimination axiom (C3)′ (resp. (C3)).

Theorem 5.13. *Let φ be a (weak) Grassmann-Plücker function on E. Then the set $\mathcal{C}_\varphi \subseteq F^E$ satisfies the weak Modular Elimination axiom* (C3)′ *(resp. the strong Modular Elimination axiom* (C3)*).*

Proof. We prove the strong case first. Let $\underline{M}$ be the matroid on E corresponding to the support of φ. Suppose we have a modular elimination structure for $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$ given by X and $(X_p)_{p \in P}$. Let z be any element of $\underline{X} \setminus \bigcup_{p \in P} \underline{X}_p$. Let $Y = \underline{X} \cup \bigcup_{p \in P} \underline{X}_p$, and consider the matroid $N = \underline{M}|Y$. Since Y has height $|P| + 1$ in the lattice of unions of circuits of $\underline{M}$, the rank of N^* is $|P| + 1$. Thus the rank of N is $|Y| - |P| - 1$. The set $I = Y \setminus (P \cup \{z\})$ has this rank and is spanning, so it is a basis of N. Let $Z \in \mathcal{C}_\varphi$ with $\underline{Z}$ given by the fundamental circuit of z with respect to I and with $Z(z) = X(z)$. It is clear that $Z(p) = 0$ for all $p \in P$. We must show that for any $f \in E$ we have $Z(f) \in X(f) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p \in P} X_p(f))$. This is clear if $f \in P \cup \{z\}$ or if $f \notin Y$, so we may suppose that $f \in I$.

Let J be a basis of N including $C \setminus \{z\}$ and let K be a basis of M/Y. Then $B_1 = J \dot\cup K$ and $B_2 = I \dot\cup K$ are bases of M. Let $x_1 = z$ and let $x_2, \ldots, x_{r+1}$ enumerate B_1. Let $y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}$ enumerate $B_2 \setminus \{f\}$. We define the constants λ_1 and λ_2 by

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\varphi(x_2, \ldots x_{r+1})}{X(z)} \qquad \lambda_2 = \varphi(f, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1})$$

Consider any i with $2 \leq i \leq r$. If $x_i \notin \underline{X}$ then $\{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots x_{r+1}\}$ is not a basis, so $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots x_{r+1}) = 0$. If $x_i \in \underline{X}$ then

$$\frac{X(x_i)}{X(z)} = -\frac{\varphi(z, x_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots x_{r+1})}{\varphi(x_i, x_2, \ldots \hat{x}_i, \ldots x_{r+1})}$$

and in either case it follows that

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots x_{r+1}) = (-1)^i \lambda_1 X(x_i).$$

This formula also clearly holds for $i = 1$.

For any $p \in P$, if $f \notin \underline{X}_p$ then $\{p, y_1, \ldots y_{r-1}\}$ is not a basis of $\underline{M}$, so $\varphi(p, y_1, \ldots y_{r-1}) = 0$. If $f \in \underline{X}_p$ then we have

$$\frac{X_p(f)}{X_p(p)} = -\frac{\varphi(p, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1})}{\varphi(f, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1})}.$$

In either case, it follows that

$$\varphi(p, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}) = \lambda_2 \frac{X_p(f)}{X(p)}.$$

Similarly we have

$$\varphi(z, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}) = -\lambda_2 \frac{Z(f)}{X(z)}.$$

Applying (GP3) we have

$$0 \in \boxplus_{i=1}^{r+1} (-1)^i \varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_{r+1}) \varphi(x_i, y_1, \ldots y_{r-1}).$$

Many of these summands are 0. If $x_i \notin Y$ then $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_{r+1}) = 0$. If $x_i \in I \setminus \{f\}$ then $\varphi(x_i, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}) = 0$. The only other possibilities are $x_i = z$, $x_i = f$ and $x_i \in P$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in -\lambda_1\lambda_2 Z(f) \boxplus \lambda_1\lambda_2 X(f) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p\in P} \lambda_1\lambda_2 X_p(f)) \\ &= \lambda_1\lambda_2 \left(-Z(f) \boxplus X(f) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p\in P} X_p(f))\right) \end{aligned}$$

from which it is clear that $Z(f) \in X(f) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p\in P} X_p(f))$.

The proof for weak Grassman-Plücker functions is essentially the same, but in the special case that $|P| = 1$. This ensures that $|\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r+1}\} \setminus \{y_1, \ldots y_{r-1}\}| = |P \cup \{z, f\}| \leq 3$, so that (GP3)$'$ can be applied instead of (GP3). □

5.6. **From Circuits to Dual Pairs.** We begin with the following result giving a weak version of the modular elimination axiom which holds for pairs of F-circuits that are not necessarily modular.

Lemma 5.14. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of F-circuits of a weak F-matroid M. Then for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, $e, f \in E$ with $X(e) = -Y(e) \neq 0$ and $Y(f) \neq -X(f)$, there is $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ with $f \in \underline{Z} \subseteq (\underline{X} \cup \underline{Y}) \backslash e$.*

Proof. This follows from the proof of [AD12, Lemma 5.4], where $X'(g) \leq X(g)$ in *loc. cit.* is interpreted to mean that $X'(g) = 0$ or $X'(g) = X(g)$ (and similarly for $Y'(g)$ and $Y(g)$). Note that the proof of [AD12, Proposition 5.1], which is used in the proof of Lemma 5.4 of *loc. cit.*, holds *mutatis mutandis* for weak matroids over a hyperfield F. □

The proof of the following result diverges somewhat from the treatment of the analogous assertion in [AD12].

Theorem 5.15. *Let M be a weak F-matroid, and let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of F-circuits of M. There is a unique F-signature $\mathcal{D}$ of $\underline{M}^*$ such that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ form a weak dual pair of F-signatures of $\underline{M}$. If M is a strong F-matroid then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ form a dual pair.*

Proof. Let D be a cocircuit of $\underline{M}$. As in the proof of [AD12, Proposition 5.6], choose a maximal independent subset A of D^c. For $e, f \in D$, choose $X_{D,e,f} \in \mathcal{C}$ with support equal to the unique circuit $C_{D,e,f}$ of $\underline{M}$ with support contained in $A \cup \{e, f\}$. Define $\mathcal{D}$ to be the collection of all $W \in F^E$ such that

$$\frac{W(e)}{W(f)} = -X_{D,e,f}(f) \odot X_{D,e,f}(e)^{-1} \tag{5.16}$$

for all $e, f \in D := \mathrm{supp}(W)$.

By the proof of Claim 1 in [AD12, Proof of Proposition 5.6], the set $\mathcal{D}$ is well-defined and independent of the choice of $X_{D,e,f}$.

It remains to prove (DP3) (resp. (DP3)′). Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $W \in \mathcal{D}$ such that if M is not a strong F-matroid then $|\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}| \leq 3$. If $\underline{X} \cap \underline{W}$ is empty then we are done, so suppose that $\underline{X} \cap \underline{W}$ is nonempty. Since $\underline{M}$ is a matroid, $\underline{X} \cap \underline{W}$ must contain at least two elements e_1 and e_2. We may assume without loss of generality that $W(e_1) = 1$. Let B be a basis of $\underline{M} \backslash \underline{W}$ including $\underline{X} \backslash \underline{W}$. Then $\hat{B} = B \cup \{e_1\}$ is a basis of $\underline{M}$. Let $P = \underline{X} \cap \underline{W} \backslash \{e_1, e_2\}$. If $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y} = 3$ then P has only one element. For each $p \in P$, let $X_p \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\underline{X_p}$ the fundamental circuit of p with respect to $\hat{B}$ and $X_p(p) = -X(p)$. Let C be the fundamental circuit of e_2 with respect to $\hat{B}$.

For any $e \in \underline{X}$, the fundamental cocircuit of e with respect to $\hat{B}$ must meet $\underline{X}$ again, and must do so in some element of $P \cup \{e\}$. Thus $\underline{X} \subseteq C \cup \bigcup_{p \in P} \underline{X_p}$, which has height $|P| + 1$ in the lattice of unions of circuits of $\underline{M}$. It follows that X and the X_p give a modular elimination structure (resp. a modular pair). So there is some $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ with $Z(p) = 0$ for all $p \in P$ and $Z(f) \in X(f) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p \in P} X_p(f))$ for any $f \in E$. Applying this with $f = e_2$ gives $Z(e_2) = X(e_2)$. For any $p \in P$ we have

$$W(p) = \frac{W(p)}{W(e_1)} = -\frac{X_p(e_1)}{X_p(p)}$$

so that $X_p(e_1) = -X_p(p)W(p) = X(p)W(p)$. Similarly, we have $Z(e_1) = -Z(e_2)W(e_2) = -X(e_2)W(e_2)$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} -X(e_2)W(e_2) \;\; = Z(e_1) \;\; &\in X(e_1) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p \in P} X_p(e_1)) \\ &= X(e_1)W(e_1) \boxplus (\boxplus_{p \in P} X(p)W(p)) \end{aligned}$$

from which it is immediate that X and W are orthogonal.

□

5.7. **Cryptomorphic axiom systems for F-matroids.** We can finally prove the main theorems from §3. We begin by proving Theorems 3.10 and 3.19 together in the following result:

Theorem 5.17. *Let E be a finite set. There are natural bijections between the following three kinds of objects:*

(C) *Collections $\mathcal{C} \subset F^E$ satisfying (C0),(C1),(C2),(C3).*
(GP) *Equivalence classes of Grassmann-Plücker functions on E satisfying (GP1),(GP2),(GP3).*
(DP) *Matroids $\underline{M}$ on E together with a dual pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ satisfying (DP1),(DP2),(DP3).*

Proof. (GP)⇒(C): If φ is a Grassmann-Plücker function, Theorem 5.13 shows that the set C_φ from Definition 5.6 satisfies (C0)-(C3).

(C)⇒ (DP): If $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies (C0)-(C3) and M denotes the corresponding F-matroid, Theorem 5.15 shows that there is a unique signature $\mathcal{D}$ of $\underline{M}^*$ such that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a dual pair of F-signatures of $\underline{M}$.

(DP)⇒(GP): If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a dual pair of F-signatures of a rank r matroid $\underline{M}$, Theorem 5.11 shows that there is a unique equivalence class of Grassmann-Plücker function $\varphi : E^r \to F$ such that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\varphi$. □

Similarly we have:

Theorem 5.18. *Let E be a finite set. There are natural bijections between the following three kinds of objects:*

(C) *Collections $\mathcal{C} \subset F^E$ satisfying (C0),(C1),(C2),(C3)′.*
(GP) *Equivalence classes of Grassmann-Plücker functions on E satisfying (GP1),(GP2),(GP3)′.*
(DP) *Matroids $\underline{M}$ on E together with a dual pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ satisfying (DP1),(DP2),(DP3)′.*

5.8. **Duality for F-matroids.** In this section, we prove Theorems 3.17 and 3.23. We begin with the following preliminary result:

Lemma 5.19. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F^E$ be the set of F-circuits of a (weak) F-matroid M. Then the set of elements of $\mathcal{C}^\perp \backslash \{0\}$ of minimal non-empty support is exactly the signature $\mathcal{D}$ of $\underline{M}^*$ given by Theorem 5.15.*

Proof. This is proved exactly like [AD12, Proof of Proposition 5.8]. □

Proof of Theorem 3.17: This follows from Theorem 5.17, Lemma 5.2, and Proposition 5.7 and 5.19, exactly as in [AD12, Proof of Theorem B]. □

Proof of Theorem 3.23: (cf. [AD12, Proof of Theorem D]) This follows from Theorem 5.17 and Lemmas 5.4 and 5.7. □

Appendix A. Errata to [AD12]

Since we rely so heavily in this paper on [AD12], we include the following list of errata.

Most of the errors in [AD12] are minor and localized, but there is one major problem which affects the paper globally. (A similar error is present in the arXiv versions 1 through 3 of the present paper.) The difficulty is in the third paragraph of the proof of Claim 3 on page 831. The authors write that if X is not orthogonal to W then neither is X'. But in order for that conclusion to follow, one would need to know that X' agrees with X on the domain of X'. However, there is no reason to expect this to hold. Because of this issue, one should view Theorems A through C in [AD12] as unproven.

In addition, we mention the following less serious mistakes:

(1) In Definition 2.4, there should be an additional axiom that the zero vector is not a phased circuit. And axiom (C1) should say $\mathrm{supp}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(Y)$ rather than $\mathrm{supp}(X) = \mathrm{supp}(Y)$.
(2) In the first bulleted point of §4.2 (top of page 822), b_0 should be b_1.
(3) In the statement of Lemma 5.2, $X(e) = Y(e)$ should be $X(e) = -Y(e)$ and $\mathcal{C}$ should be $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$. Note that Lemma 5.2 is not actually used in any of the subsequent arguments.
(4) In the statements of Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.4, the hypothesis $X(f) \neq Y(f)$ should be replaced with $X(f) \neq -Y(f)$. And in the third line from the end of the proof of Lemma 5.4, $X(f) \neq Y(f) = Y'(f)$ should be $-X(f) \neq Y(f) = Y'(f)$.

(5) In Lemmas 4.5 and Proposition 5.6, the correct hypotheses are that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ form a dual pair of circuit signatures for some matroid M. This is all that is used in the proofs, and if one makes the stronger assumption in Proposition 5.6 that $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ are the phased circuits (resp. cocircuits) of a phased matroid then the proof of Corollary 5.7 is incomplete.
(6) In the second line of the proof of Proposition 5.3, the authors refer to the cocircuits of the phased matroid defined by φ, but one doesn't actually know at this point in their chain of reasoning that the modular elimination axiom holds for what eventually ends up being the phased matroid defined by φ. Their proof is nevertheless correct.

Remark A.1. In Definition 2.4, the authors write $Z(g) \leq \max\{X(g), Y(g)\}$ in the "else" case, but this inequality can be replaced with equality; this follows from the "symmetric difference" part of [Whi87, Lemma 2.7.1]. The latter result also implies that axiom (ME) in Definition 2.4 (and also in Proposition A.21) can be replaced with a stronger axiom in which one asks for a **unique** $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ with the stated properties.

References

[AD12] Laura Anderson and Emanuele Delucchi. Foundations for a theory of complex matroids. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 48(4):807–846, 2012.

[And16] Laura Anderson. Vectors of matroids over hyperfields. Preprint. Available at `arxiv:math.CO/1607.04868`, 25 pages, 2016.

[Ber90] Vladimir G. Berkovich. *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*, volume 33 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.

[BLV78] Robert G. Bland and Michel Las Vergnas. Orientability of matroids. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B.*, 24(1):94–123, 1978.

[BLVS+99] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M. Ziegler. *Oriented matroids*, volume 46 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1999.

[BPR06] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy. *Algorithms in real algebraic geometry*, volume 10 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.

[CC10] Alain Connes and Caterina Consani. From monoids to hyperstructures: in search of an absolute arithmetic. In *Casimir force, Casimir operators and the Riemann hypothesis*, pages 147–198. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2010.

[CC11] Alain Connes and Caterina Consani. The hyperring of adèle classes. *J. Number Theory*, 131(2):159–194, 2011.

[Del11] Emanuele Delucchi. Modular elimination in matroids and oriented matroids. *European J. Combin.*, 32(3):339–343, 2011.

[Dre86] Andreas W. M. Dress. Duality theory for finite and infinite matroids with coefficients. *Adv. in Math.*, 59(2):97–123, 1986.

[DW91] Andreas W. M. Dress and Walter Wenzel. Grassmann-Plücker relations and matroids with coefficients. *Adv. Math.*, 86(1):68–110, 1991.

[DW92] Andreas W. M. Dress and Walter Wenzel. Valuated matroids. *Adv. Math.*, 93(2):214–250, 1992.

[FM15] Alex Fink and Luca Moci. Matroids over a ring. To appear in *J. of the European Mathematical Society*. Preprint available at `arXiv:1209.6571`, 48 pages, 2015.

[Fre13] Bart Frenk. Tropical varieties, maps, and gossip. Ph.D. thesis. Available at `http://alexandria.tue.nl/extra2/750815.pdf`, 167 pages, 2013.

[GG15] Jeff Giansiracusa and Noah Giansiracusa. A grassmann algebra for matroids. Preprint. Available at `arxiv:math.AG/1510.04584`, 18 pages, 2015.

[GJL16] Jeffrey Giansiracusa, Jaiung Jun, and Oliver Lorscheid. On the relation between hyperrings and fuzzy rings. Preprint. Available at `arxiv:math.CO/1607.01973`, 22 pages, 2016.

[IR10] Zur Izhakian and Louis Rowen. Supertropical algebra. *Adv. Math.*, 225(4):2222–2286, 2010.
[IR11] Zur Izhakian and Louis Rowen. Supertropical matrix algebra. *Israel J. Math.*, 182:383–424, 2011.
[Jun15a] Jaiung Jun. Algebraic geometry over hyperrings. Preprint. Available at `arxiv:math.AG/1512.04837`, 37 pages, 2015.
[Jun15b] Jaiung Jun. Valuations of semirings. Preprint. Available at `arxiv:math.AG/1503.01392`, 12 pages, 2015.
[KL72] Steven L. Kleiman and Dan Laksov. Schubert calculus. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 79:1061–1082, 1972.
[Mar96] Murray A. Marshall. *Spaces of orderings and abstract real spectra*, volume 1636 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
[Mar06] Murray A. Marshall. Real reduced multirings and multifields. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 205(2):452–468, 2006.
[Mas85] Ch. G. Massouros. Methods of constructing hyperfields. *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, 8(4):725–728, 1985.
[MS15] Diane Maclagan and Bernd Sturmfels. *Introduction to tropical geometry*, volume 161 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
[MT01] Kazuo Murota and Akihisa Tamura. On circuit valuation of matroids. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 26(3):192–225, 2001.
[Oxl92] James G. Oxley. *Matroid theory*. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.
[Vir10] Oleg Y. Viro. Hyperfields for Tropical Geometry I. Hyperfields and dequantization. Preprint. Available at `arxiv:math.AG/1006.3034`, 45 pages, 2010.
[Vir11] Oleg Y. Viro. On basic concepts of tropical geometry. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 273(Sovremennye Problemy Matematiki):271–303, 2011.
[Whi87] Neil White, editor. *Combinatorial geometries*, volume 29 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

E-mail address: `mbaker@math.gatech.edu`

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

E-mail address: `Nathan.Bowler@uni-hamburg.de`

Department of Mathematics, Universität Hamburg, Germany